DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 600 RC 008 301

AUTHOR	Rodriguez, Rodolfo, Comp.
TITLE	A Preliminary Study of 5th Year ESEA Title VII Bilingual Bicultural Programs with High Concentrations of Mexican American Students.
INSTITUTION	National Education Task Force de la Raza, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
SPONS AGENCY	National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[73]
NOTE	49p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; Community Involvement; *Educational Programs; Enrollment; *Federal Programs; Financial Support; *Mexican Americans; Parent Participation; Student Teacher Ratio; *Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII; ESEA Title VII

ABSTRACT

In preparation for the National Bilingual Institute which was held November 28-December 1, 1973, a mail survey of fifth year ESEA (Elementary and Secondary Education Act) Title VII Bilingual Education Projects was conducted. Its purpose was to obtain data relative to the progress of bilingual bicultural education programs since implementation of the original Title VII legislation in 1969. Since the institute was concerned with Bilingual Bicultural Education as it affects the Mexican American child, those projects with a heavy concentration of Mexican American students were selected. Fifty-eight projects were sent survey questionnaires; 30 responded. The questionnaire was divided into: Basic Program Information; Instructional Component; Impact of Program; and Parent and Community Involvement. Project directors were asked to make recommendations for: national legislation, state legislation, U.S. Office of Education, State Departments of Education, school boards, teacher training institutions, and Chicano communities and parents. Among the findings were: the pupil/teacher ratio varied noticeably from project to project; 87 percent indicated having a language maintenance program; and 50 percent reported having influenced the development of bilingual programs in adjacent districts. (NQ)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED100600

A PRELIMINARY STUDY OF 5TH YEAR ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL BICULTURAL PROGRAMS WITH HIGH CONCENTRATIONS OF MEXICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS

Prepared in Preparation for

The National Bilingual Bicultural Institute

Co-sponsored

by

The National Education Task Force de la Raza

and

The National Education Association

[1973]

Compiled and Submitted

by

Rodolfo Rodríguez
Administrative Intern

Co-Editors

Elias R. Bernal
Administrative Intern

Dr. Henry J. Casso
Exec. Director
National Educ. Task Force de la Raza

The National Education Task Force de la Raza
The College of Education
The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

AC008801

PREFACE

This document is a preliminary study of the fifth year federally funded ESEA Title VII projects which have a high concentration of Mexican American students. The original objective of this study was to provide information for the planners, speakers, moderators and panelists of the National Bilingual Bicultural Institute, "A Relook at Tucson '66 and Beyond," held November 28 - December 1, 1973 in Albuquerque, New Mexico. It must be pointed out that, as the Institute was concerned with Bilingual Bicultural Education as it affects the Mexican American child, this was an underlying factor in the selection of these projects. Also, fifth year projects were chosen as it was felt that, since they were the first and earliest projects, much could be learned from their experience.

In reviewing the results of the study, however, it was decided that the importance of the information gained warranted its immediate dissemination in its present form to the project directors who responded to the survey. On the other hand, a small committee is presently working on computerizing the information obtained by this survey which will enable us to make an in-depth analysis of the data. This will become Report 4 of the Institute and will contain not only a computerized analysis of the respondent information, but will also contain conclusions, implications and recommendations based on this data.

This study provides first hand information as to what is currently taking place throughout the country. Although this information is based on projects with a high concentration of Mexican American students, it is our perception that it is indicative of what is transpiring in programs with 1-4 years' experience or where there are concentrations of other linguistically and culturally distinct children. This is a proposition which the Institute planners and the Task Force will be pursuing.

In view of the fact that there are any number of states which are passing legislation for Bilingual Bicultural Education Programs, the information contained in this study and the subsequent Report 4 will, as it did for us in the Institute, provide valuable directions for program planning.

Some of the significant points found in this study which need careful review are:

1. The funding range of projects ranges from $80,000 to $4,000,000.

2. There is a heavy concentration of Mexican American students in the responding projects (88% Mexican American, 8% Anglo and 3% Black).

3. The pupil/teacher ratio varies noticeably from one project to another.

4. In administration, 50% of the evaluators have functional use of Spanish, whereas the remaining 50% are monolingual English speakers. As will be shown in Institute Report 4, the Bilingual evaluators have a tendency to use criterion referenced tests, whereas the monolingual evaluators have a tendency to use standardized tests.

5. Of utmost significance, eighty seven percent (87%) indicated having a language maintenance program whereas only thirteen percent (13%) reported having a transitional program.*

6. Regarding standardized tests, the most frequently used test was the Inter American Series, which the Bay Area Bilingual Education League has taken serious exception to.

7. In the area of support for Bilingual Education (p.14), greater emphasis needs to be placed on gaining support from members of boards of education, project school principals, teachers in non-bilingual classes, local teacher associations, local colleges of education or teacher training institutions, and the community at large.

8. There is an interesting distance between parents used as volunteers and their assistance in the writing of bilingual curriculum material.

Tremendous gratitude must be given to the project directors, busy administrators that they are, who dedicated so much time in providing the responses to the survey which made this study possible. Gratitude is also expressed to Rudy Rodriguez and Elias Bernal, Administrative Interns in the Task Force office. Both are doctoral students who labored long to make this study a reality.

* In Institute Report 2, it was found that of the 220 respondents to an Institute participation survey consisting of participants from 25 states, 31.8% were teachers or professors, 20% administrators, 16.8% project or program coordinators, 11.5% students, 3.2% community representatives, and 1.8% paraprofessionals. 14.5% of the respondents identified themselves in the "other" category. 46% indicated they employed the Language Maintenance Program with regard to the Spanish-English language development whereas only 12.7% of the respondents indicated they employed the Transitional Program in language development.

Finally, it is our hope, in presenting this study, that it will provide some view as to what is taking place in Bilingual Bicultural Education, with the objective of helping educational leaders, students, parents and communities help improve what is currently going on toward quality education for the linguistically and culturally distinct child in America.

Dr. Henry J. Casso
Executive Secretary
National Education Task Force de la Raza
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87131

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. BASIC PROGRAM INFORMATION	3
II. INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT	6
III. IMPACT OF PROGRAM	11
IV. PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT	16
V. PROJECT DIRECTORS' RECOMMENDATIONS	18
APPENDIXES	22
A. SURVEY OF ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL BICULTURAL PROGRAMS	22
B. ESEA TITLE VII PROJECTS RECEIVING SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	32
C. ESEA TITLE VII PROJECTS RESPONDING TO NATIONAL BILINGUAL BICULTURAL INSTITUTE SURVEY	37

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROJECTS SURVEYED BY STATES	1
2.	ESEA TITLE VII FUNDING RANGE OF PROJECTS RESPONDING TO SURVEY	3
3.	SCHOOLS/CLASSES/PUPILS IN ESEA TITLE VII PROJECTS REPORTED BY LEVELS	4
4.	NUMBER OF ESEA TITLE VII PROJECT PERSONNEL BY JOB POSITION	5
5.	BILINGUAL EDUCATION INSTRUCTIONAL MODELS	7
6.	MAJOR BILINGUAL SUBJECT AREAS AND DEGREE OF PUPIL SUCCESS BASED ON JUDGMENT OF PROJECT DIRECTORS	8
7.	COMPOSITE PERCENTAGE FIGURES SHOWING THE LOCAL DISTRICT'S (LEA) SUPPORT FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION	12
8.	CHIEF SOURCE OF FUNDING FOR BILINGUAL PROJECT SCHOOLS OPERATING OUTSIDE ESEA TITLE VII	12
9.	BILINGUAL PROJECT SCHOOLS OPERATING OUTSIDE ESEA TITLE VII, BY LEVEL AND CLASSES	13
10.	GENERAL ATTITUDE OF KEY TARGET GROUPS TOWARD THE SUPPORT OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION	14
11.	PARENT INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES WHICH WERE TYPICAL OF THE PROJECTS REPORTING	16
12.	PROJECT DIRECTORS' RESPONSE TO ESEA TITLE VII ADVISORY COUNCILS	17

INTRODUCTION

In preparation for the National Bilingual Bicultural Institute which was held November 28 - December 1, 1973, in Albuquerque, New Mexico, a mail survey of fifth year ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Projects was conducted by the Institute Planning Committee (see Appendix A). The intent of this inquiry was to secure data relative to the progress of bilingual bicultural education programs since the implementation of the original ESEA Title VII legislation in 1969.

Fifty-eight (58) projects were identified and sent survey questionnaires (see Appendix B). Of this number, thirty (30) responded (see Appendix C). Table 1 indicates the projects responding to the survey representing a 51% return.

TABLE 1

ESEA TITLE VII BILINGUAL EDUCATION
PROJECTS SURVEYED BY STATES

State	No. of Projects Receiving Survey	No. of Projects Responding
Arizona	4	3
California	26	9
Colorado	1	1
New Mexico	5	5
Texas	18	10
Illinois	1	0

TABLE 1 (continued)

State	No. of Projects Receiving Survey	No. of Projects Responding
Michigan	1	0
Wisconsin	1	1
Florida	1	1
Totals	58	30

I

BASIC PROGRAM INFORMATION

The largest number of bilingual projects in their fifth year of operation fall in the $80,000 - $160,000 funding range. Other sources of funds being used by bilingual programs to supplement ESEA Title VII monies are local, state, ESEA Title I and ESEA funds. The largest portion of supplementary support was from local district funds. Forty percent (40%) of the projects indicated using ESAA Title I funds in the bilingual program.

TABLE 2

ESEA TITLE VII FUNDING RANGE OF PROJECTS RESPONDING TO SURVEY*

Funding Range	No. of Projects
Under $80,000	6
$ 80,000 - $160,000	8
$161,000 - $240,000	4
$241,000 - $320,000	1
$321,000 - $400,000	1
Over $400,000	1

*Nine (9) of the respondents failed to show their current level of funding.

THE TOTAL STUDENT ENROLLMENT COVERED BY THE SURVEY WAS 23,306. THIS COMPOSITE FIGURE REPRESENTS THE FOLLOWING ETHNIC BREAKDOWN. 88% MEXICAN AMERICAN, 8% ANGLO, AND 3% BLACK. ONE PERCENT (1%) OF THE STUDENT PARTICIPANTS WERE COMPRISED CHIEFLY OF PUERTO RICANS, ORIENTALS, AND NATIVE AMERICANS.

TABLE 3

SCHOOLS/CLASSES/PUPILS IN ESEA TITLE VII
PROJECTS REPORTED BY LEVELS

Grade Levels	No. of Schools	Percent	No. of Classes	No. of Pupils	Percent	Pupil/Teacher Ratio
Prekindergarten	15	8	35	687	3	1-19
Kindergarten	55	28	108	2,720	2	1-25
Elementary	112	55	641	17,649	75	1-28
Junior High School	11	6	43	1,097	5	1-25
High School[a]	5	2	102	1,028	4	1-10
Parochial[b]	4	1	3	125	1	1-42
Totals	202	100	932	23,306	100	

[a]Respondents did not indicate reason for low pupil/teacher ratio.

[b]Two (2) respondents did not show number of classes and pupils.

The number of bilingual personnel was satisfactory for each position listed, except the evaluator's position where only fifty percent (50%) were reported as being functional in Spanish. Also, the inclusion

of parents of project children in teacher aide positions was relatively small in comparison to the large number of teacher aide slots available in the projects reporting.

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF ESEA TITLE VII PROJECT PERSONNEL BY JOB POSITION

Job Titles	No. of Personnel	No. Having Functional Use of Spanish[a]
Administrators	30	27
Evaluators	28	14
Supervisors	55	53
Teachers	827	655
Teacher Aides	530	528
Teacher Aides (parents of project children)	90	90
Others[b]	107	107
Totals	1,647	1,474

[a]It is assumed that these personnel were equally functional in English.

[b]These positions were listed as community liaison personnel, social workers, teacher corps interns (or the like), media specialists, Spanish language specialists, home school aides, curriculum writers, office help, etc.

II

INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT

WITH REGARD TO THE GENERAL ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN OF THE BILINGUAL BICULTURAL PROGRAMS RESPONDING TO THE SURVEY, EIGHTY-SEVEN PERCENT (87%) INDICATED HAVING A LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM WHEREAS ONLY THIRTEEN PERCENT (13%) REPORTED HAVING A TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM. LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS WERE DEFINED IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE AS PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO DEVELOP AND EXPAND THE TWO LANGUAGES (ENGLISH AND SPANISH) AND RELATED CULTURES THROUGHOUT THE COURSE OF THE PROGRAM. TRANSITIONAL PROGRAMS WERE DEFINED AS PROJECTS USING SPANISH IN THE INSTRUCTION FOR THE SPANISH-SPEAKING CHILD SOLELY AS A BRIDGE TO LEARNING ENGLISH.

The fact that most respondents indicated having language maintenance programs was most interesting considering that several national organizations are pushing the Massachusetts bilingual bicultural model which is transitional in nature. It is further understood that the present legislation in the Congress is "hung up" over efforts to push the transitional model rather than the language maintenance program.

Instructional models (or class techniques) most common among the ESEA Title VII projects responding were team teaching, individualized instruction, and the self-contained classroom. Table 5 also shows that the majority of the respondents felt that these models were operating at a level of success listed as "good." It was not unusual for respondents to show two or three grades, for example, using different

models in each grade. As might be expected, the self-contained classroom was especially popular in the preschool and primary grades (1-3).

TABLE 5

BILINGUAL EDUCATION INSTRUCTIONAL MODELS*

Education Model	Percentage of Degree of Success			
	High	Good	Moderate	Low
Team Teaching (N=17)	24	44	17	15
Open Space (N=7)	28	43	29	0
Individualized Instruction (N=17)	24	61	15	0
Programmed Instruction (N=4)	25	50	25	0
Non-gradedness (N=5)	0	60	20	20
Self-contained Class (N=18)	27	61	12	0

*The questionnaire did not request respondents to describe the instructional models pertaining to their respective projects.

WHEN ASKED HOW IS SPANISH/ENGLISH INSTRUCTION PROVIDED IN BILINGUAL CLASSES HAVING MONOLINGUAL TEACHERS, FIFTY-FOUR PERCENT (54%) OF THE RESPONDENTS INDICATED BILINGUAL AIDES PROVIDE FOR THE SPANISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION; FORTY-TWO PERCENT (42%) INDICATED BILINGUAL TEACHERS WORK

COOPERATIVELY WITH MONOLINGUAL TEACHERS. FOUR PERCENT (4%) OF THE RESPONDENTS REPORTED HAVING A COMPLETE STAFF OF BILINGUAL TEACHERS.

Evaluation instruments used by respondents to determine degree of pupil success in the subject areas listed in Table 6 were varied. The majority, forty-three percent (43%), indicated using only standardized tests in assessing pupil academic performance. Seventeen percent (17%) of the respondents reported using only locally-developed tests with THE MAJORITY OF THESE PROJECTS RELYING ON CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTING. Twenty-three percent (23%) of the projects used a combination of locally-developed and standardized tests.

TABLE 6

MAJOR BILINGUAL SUBJECT AREAS AND DEGREE OF PUPIL SUCCESS BASED ON JUDGMENT OF PROJECT DIRECTORS*

Subject Area	Percentage of Degree of Success			
	High	Good	Moderate	Low
Spanish Reading	19	62	16	3
English Reading	12	60	28	0
English as a Second Language	25	58	17	0
Spanish as a Second Language	4	61	35	0
Mathematics	21	50	26	3
Science	0	70	30	0
Social Studies	18	68	14	0

TABLE 6 (continued)

Subject Area	Percentage of Degree of Success			
	High	Good	Moderate	Low
Bicultural Development (development of affective domain)	24	64	12	0
Pre-school English Language Developments	30	63	7	0

*Degree of pupil success in each of the above subject areas listed was requested for the total project rather than individual grade levels.

The following were standardized tests most commonly reported in the survey. This list is in accordance to order of preference.

Inter American Series
Metropolitan Readiness Test
Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
California Achievement and Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills
Stanford Achievement Test

In regard to standardized tests, it is important to note the action of BABEL (Bay Area Bilingual Education League, June, 1972- Bilingual Testing and Assessment Proceedings of BABEL Workshop).

1. Whereas currently used standardized tests do not measure the potential and ability of California Bilingual or Bicultural children, and whereas these tests are being used as if they do so measure, and they are relied upon to the counsel, place and track these children, this body hereby resolves that such use of standardized tests should be immediately discontinued.

2. Sufficient evidence now exists to direct us to the development of Criterion Referenced Assessment systems as a means of improving educational programs accountability for learning activities. It is imperative that these evaluation processes be correlated with local performance objectives.

A PARTICULARLY SIGNIFICANT OBSERVATION WAS THE TENDENCY TOWARD THE USE OF CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS IN PROJECTS HAVING BILINGUAL EVALUATORS.

III

IMPACT OF PROGRAM

IT IS SIGNIFICANT TO NOTE THAT LESS THAN HALF, THIRTY-SIX PERCENT (36%), OF THE FIFTH YEAR BILINGUAL PROJECTS HAVE A STATEMENT OF POLICY APPROVED BY THEIR RESPECTIVE BOARDS OF EDUCATION. THIS MEANS THAT SIXTY-FOUR PERCENT (64%) OF THE PROJECTS DO NOT HAVE A DEFINITE WRITTEN POSITION ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION APPROVED BY THEIR DISTRICTS. IMPORTANT ADVANTAGES OF THIS ACTION ON THE PART OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION ARE:

1. A STATEMENT OF POSITION HELPS GIVE BILINGUAL EDUCATION STATUS AND CREDITABILITY.

2. A STATEMENT OF POSITION STRENGTHENS ADMINISTRATIVE AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION.

3. THIS TYPE OF BOARD ACTION HELPS TO GIVE A DEFINITE PURPOSE AND DIRECTION TO THE BILINGUAL PROGRAM; THEREFORE INCREASING CONFIDENCE IN THE PERSONNEL DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT.

DESPITE THE ABOVE, THERE ARE STRONG INDICATIONS THAT DISTRICTS ARE TAKING ADVANTAGE OF FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS TO EXPAND THE SCOPE OF THE BILINGUAL PROGRAM. WHEN ASKED "DO YOU HAVE A BILINGUAL PROGRAM NOW IN OPERATION NOT FUNDED BY TITLE VII?" SEVENTY PERCENT (70%) OF THE RESPONDENTS ANSWERED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE. TABLE 8 SHOWS PERTINENT DATA RELATIVE TO NON-TITLE VII SUPPORTED BILINGUAL PROGRAMS.

TABLE 7

COMPOSITE PERCENTAGE FIGURES SHOWING THE LOCAL DISTRICT'S (LEA) SUPPORT FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Action of LEAs	Percent of Respondents
A statement of position on bilingual education has been written and passed by the Board of Education	36
The LEA has approved the use of local funds to expand the bilingual program.	40
The LEA has committed the use of local funds to continue the bilingual program beyond federal funding.	46
The LEA has adopted some of the successful bilingual materials and methods in non-bilingual schools.	53
The LEA is making an earnest effort to fill all teaching positions in the bilingual program with bilingual teachers.	80

TABLE 8

CHIEF SOURCE OF FUNDING FOR BILINGUAL PROJECT SCHOOLS OPERATING OUTSIDE ESEA TITLE VII

Funding Source	Percentage of Projects
Local	32
State	32
ESEA Title I	16
ESAA	20

The total student enrollment for the bilingual projects funded from the above sources was 16,644. The enthnicity of these students was: 86% Mexican American, 9% Anglo, 4% Black, and 1% Other.

A total of 221 schools were served by these bilingual programs. Table 9 shows the breakdown of these schools by levels.

TABLE 9

BILINGUAL PROJECT SCHOOLS OPERATING OUTSIDE ESEA TITLE VII, BY LEVEL AND CLASSES

Grade/Level	No. of Schools	Percentage
Prekindergarten	6	3
Kindergarten	88	40
Elementary	118	53
Junior High	3	1
High School	6	3
Parochial	0	0
Totals	221	100

It is interesting to note in Table 10 that two groups in particular were reported as having a significant moderate-to-low attitude toward bilingual education. This was indicated by teachers in non-bilingual classes and local teacher associations.

Table 10 also reflects a need to work with federal and state legislators so that they can be influenced in developing a more positive

attitude toward bilingual education as their decisions are key to the future of bilingual education.

TABLE 10

GENERAL ATTITUDE OF KEY TARGET GROUPS TOWARD THE SUPPORT OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Target Groups	Percentage				
	High	Good	Moderate	Low	Lack Basis for Comment
Board of Education	26	36	33	3	0
School Administration	30	53	10	7	0
Project School Principals	46	30	20	4	0
Project Staff (Including teachers)	67	33	0	0	0
Teachers in non-bilingual classes	0	20	46	24	10
Parents of Project Pupils	77	17	6	0	0
Pupils in Bilingual Program	61	33	6	0	0
Project Para-Professional Personnel	69	31	0	0	0
Local Teacher Association	15	31	27	12	15
Local College of Education or Teacher Training Institutions	19	51	24	3	3
Community-at-Large	26	48	20	3	3
Local Area-State Legislative Delegation	18	36	14	0	32
Local Area-National Congressional Delegation	16	36	8	8	32

APPROXIMATELY FIFTY PERCENT (50%) OF THE RESPONDENTS REPORTED HAVING INFLUENCED THE DEVELOPMENT OF BILINGUAL PROGRAMS IN ADJACENT DISTRICTS AS WELL AS THE DEVELOPMENT OF BILINGUAL TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES LOCATED IN PROXIMITY TO THE BILINGUAL PROJECTS.

IV

PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Seventy-one percent (71%) of the respondents indicated having funds in their budgets specifically earmarked for parent involvement activities, e.g., community agents, visiting teachers, supplies for community activities, etc. Sixty-two percent (62%) reported publishing a program newsletter for parents.

TABLE 11

PARENT INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES WHICH WERE TYPICAL OF THE PROJECTS REPORTING

Parent Activity	Percentage of Projects Reporting Activity
Work as volunteer aides in the bilingual schools.	73
Help promote cultural development in the bilingual schools, e.g., by telling stories of Mexican American folklore and history.	83
Participate in advisory councils in each of the project schools.	83
Assist in the writing of bilingual curriculum materials.	20
Others (see below).	6

Other parent involvement activities included:

1. Parents assisting in education programs which consisted of "toy lending libraries" and "educational games lending kits."

2. One reported using a "Home Task Scheme" at the prekindergarten and kindergarten level.

3. "Parent and community people visit classrooms as role models . . . ."

4. Some projects reported involving parents in cultural and heritage days such as "Navidad" and "Cinco de Mayo."

IT IS SIGNIFICANT TO NOTE THAT 54% OF THE ADVISORY COUNCILS WERE INFLUENTIAL IN THE DECISIONS WHICH AFFECTED THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF BILINGUAL PROGRAMS. FURTHERMORE, 57% OF THE ADVISORY COUNCILS WERE MEETING ON A REGULAR MONTHLY BASIS WHILE 36% WERE MEETING LESS FREQUENTLY.

TABLE 12

PROJECT DIRECTORS' RESPONSE TO
ESEA TITLE VII ADVISORY COUNCILS

Items Describing Bilingual Advisory Councils	Percentage of Respondents
The advisory council is composed chiefly of parents of project students.	80
The members of the advisory council are selected by the bilingual program staff.	27
The members of the council are selected by project parents.	43
The advisory council is functioning in accordance with guidelines which council members have prepared.	40

V

PROJECT DIRECTORS' RECOMMENDATIONS

National Legislation

1. Respondents generally felt the need for the federal government to continue funding of ESEA Title VII bilingual projects beyond the expiration period of federal support. For example:

> Continued support and funding of programs where needed and extension of time on five year programs where justifiable.

> Drop 5 year funding stipulation.

2. Furthermore, the project directors recommended that the federal government strengthen its position on bilingual education.

> National and state legislation is needed which would make it mandatory for local districts to offer bilingual education in areas where there is a large concentration of children whose first language is other than English . . . .

> The bilingual bicultural education movement must receive impetus starting with national legislation right on down. This impetus would encourage state level interest followed by action of local school boards.

State Legislation

Respondents indicated the need for legislators to strengthen their support of bilingual programs. For example:

> State legislation helps give bilingual education status and credibility.

> States must stop appropriating token sums if quality performances of bilingual programs is expected.

> Continued support of programs and increase in appropriation to extend programs where needed--especially in grades 1 thru 6.

Every effort must be put forth to instruct our legislators that we want this program because it affords the best education our youth has received in the history of education in this country.

U.S. Office of Education

The following were typical recommendations directed at the U.S. Office of Education by the bilingual project directors:

that exemplary bilingual education programs which are completing their fifth year of federal funding be permitted to apply for additional funds in order to extend the program into new grades.

that exemplary bilingual education programs be selected and processes developed by which the model programs will be available for visitation by personnel from other school districts.

USOE recognize that bilingual education is for everyone.

In analyzing other parts of the survey, it was apparent that the majority of the projects were not supplementing ESEA Title VII funds with other available federal funds such as ESAA and ESEA Title I.

State Departments of Education

Project directors expressed the need to increase the number of state-level bilingual program supportive personnel.

The State Department of Education should have sufficient personnel to assist local programs in all matters pertaining to bilingual education.

State Education Agencies should provide more consultant services to school districts.

School Boards

1. Respondents indicated that school board members needed to become better informed about bilingual education. Typical comments were:

School boards need orientation and information.

School boards need to be informed of the advantages bilingual education offers all children.

Local schools should encourage their school board members to visit bilingual programs so that they will have a better idea of what bilingual education is.

2. It was further indicated that there exists a lack of interest and support for bilingual programs by local school boards. For example:

School boards should support and encourage bilingual education in communities . . . .

Boards must become sensitized to the needs of the entire student population.

Boards need to recognize the importance of Bilingual Advisory Councils and its influence in improving education.

Responses to other items within the survey questionnaire showed that the majority of the districts with ESEA Title VII programs did not have a policy of position on bilingual education.

Teacher Training Institutions

Recommendations in the area of teacher training dealt mainly with the need to develop and/or improve teacher training programs designed for teachers in bilingual education programs. For example:

Efforts are being made and should be continued to increase offerings of use to teachers already in bilingual programs . . . .

Move to provide the quality teacher training desperately needed . . . .

That funds be made available to teacher training institutions to enable them to cooperatively develop bilingual bicultural teacher training programs for undergraduate, graduate, as well as in-service and summer teacher training institutes.

Chicano Communities

Respondents indicated that Chicano parents should be encouraged to become more involved in the education of their children.

> Parents in Chicano communities should be advised about bilingual programs and should be encouraged to visit such programs . . . .
>
> Parents need to become politically involved in their schools and government. They must speak out for sound educational programs and take an even firmer stand on their success or failure.

APPENDIX A

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A

NATIONAL EDUCATION TASK FORCE DE LA RAZA

The University of New Mexico – College of Education
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131 – Phone 277-5649 – 277-5640

October 31, 1973

NATIONAL CHAIRMAN
Dr. Rupert Trujillo
Assistant Dean
College of Education
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, N.M. 87131

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
Dr. Henry J. Casso
Associate Professor
College of Education
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, N.M. 87131

REGIONAL CHAIRMEN
Manuel Andrade
Assistant Director
Elementary Education
414 14th St.
Denver Public Schools
Denver, Colorado 70202

Dr. Jose Cardenas
Executive Director
Texans for Educational Excellence
214 Dwyer St. Suite 309
San Antonio, Texas 78204

Dr. Salomon Flores
Director
Programs for the Spanish Speaking
Chicago State University
9600 At King Drive
Chicago, Ill. 60628

Dr. Robert Segura
Assistant Professor
School of Education
Sacramento State University
6000 J. St.
Sacramento, Calif. 95819

TO: Selected Bilingual Bicultural ESEA Title VII Programs with a high percentage of Mexican American students

FROM: Dr. Henry J. Casso, Mr. Rudy Rodríguez, Mr. Tomás Villarreal
National Bilingual Bicultural Institute Survey Committee

SUBJECT: Survey of ESEA Title VII Bilingual Bicultural Programs.

The National Education Task Force De La Raza and the National Education Association is sponsoring a National Bilingual Bicultural Institute with the theme, "A Relook at Tucson '66 and Beyond." The Institute will be held Nov. 28 - Dec. 1, 1973, at the Western Skies Motor Hotel in Albuquerque, New Mexico (tentative program schedule is enclosed).

Our National Bilingual Bicultural Institute is designed to influence the direction of national and state legislation as well as policies of state school boards and departments of education. In addition, it is hoped that this influence will extend to teacher associations, teacher training institutions, and local school boards.

The enclosed questionnaire has been developed to secure information crucial to the future of bilingual education in this country. The data collected from this Survey will serve as the basis for a composite report which will be distributed not only to the participants of the above-mentioned Institute, but likewise to key national and state decision-makers who have an influence on Bilingual Bicultural education.

As you may know, the U.S. Office of Education is holding hearings on the ESEA Title VII regulations for the coming year. Hearings on the Kennedy, Montoya, and Cranston new bilingual legislation are also being held in the U.S. Senate.

Through your collaboration we can ensure a brighter future for bilingual education by increasing legislative and educational interest and support.

This inquiry is not intended to be an evaluation of individual projects. Therefore, we would appreciate your being as candid as possible in your responses.

Your assistance is requested in completing this survey and returning it to our office by November 13, 1973. We realize that this is an additional demand on your time and energy; however, it is our feeling that the future of many of our children is dependent on you.

Project directors responding to our survey are assured a copy of this report.

Enclosures

A federally funded program to increase educational opportunities

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SURVEY OF ESEA TITLE VII PROGRAMS
IN PREPARATION FOR THE
NATIONAL BILINGUAL BICULTURAL INSTITUTE

Section I. Basic Program Information

(1) School District Reporting:

a. Name of District_____

b. Address_____ c. Bilingual Office Phone No._____

d. Project Director_____ Date_____

(2) ESEA Title VII Program Information:

a. Title of Project_____

b. Current ESEA Title VII Fund level(Grant)_____
Other sources of funding coordinated with ESEA Title VII. (Check sources which apply)
_____ 1. Local _____ 3. State _____ 5. Other (Specify)
_____ 2. Title I _____ 4. ESAA

c. Funding Period_____ d. Circle all grade levels involved in your Title VII program:

Pre-K K 1 2 3 4 5
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 Adult Ed.

e. Give number of schools participating in your Title VII bilingual program for each level indicated:

Pre-K	K	Elementary	Jr. High	High School	Parochial

Give number of classes participating in your bilingual program for each level indicated

Pre-K	K	Elementary	Jr. High	High School	Parochial

Give student enrollment in your bilingual program for each level indicated below:

Pre-K	K	Elementary	Jr. High	High School	Parochial

(3) Program staff/pupil data:

a. Total ESEA Title VII Program student enrollment_____

b. Ethnic breakdown of project students

Mexican American	Anglo	Black	Other (Specify)

c. Personnel directly involved in ESEA Title VII Project:

	Total	Number having functional Use of Spanish
1. Administrator(s)	____	____
2. Evaluator(s)	____	____
3. Supervisors	____	____
4. Teachers	____	____
5. Teacher Aides	____	____
6. Teacher Aides (Parents of project children)	____	____
7. Others (who)		
_____	____	____
_____	____	____
_____	____	____
_____	____	____

Section II. Instruction

(1) Use of English and Spanish Language in teaching:

a. List the subjects in which each language is used.

Grade or Level	Subjects taught entirely in English (include English Language Arts and ESL if taught)	Subjects taught entirely in Spanish (include Spanish Language Arts and Spanish SL if taught)	Subjects taught partly in one, and partly in the other (state percentage for each)

b. Check the statement below which best describes the intent of your bilingual program with regard to Spanish/English language development.

_____ 1. The instructional program is designed to develop and expand the two languages and related cultures throughout the course of the program. (Language maintenance program)

_____ 2. Spanish is used in the instructional program for the Spanish-speaking child as a "bridge" to learning English. Once the child has achieved an adequate command of English, Spanish is dropped from his instructional program. (Transitional program)

(2) Check the models listed below which apply to the organization of your instructional program.

	Grade or Level	Degree of Success			
		High	Good	Moderate	Low
Team Teaching					
Open Space					
Individualized Instruction					
Programmed Instruction					
Non-gradedness					
Self-contained class					
Others (list)					

(3) How is Spanish/English instruction provided in bilingual classes having monolingual teachers? (Check items which apply)

_____ a. Bilingual aides provide for the Spanish language instruction.

_____ b. Bilingual teachers work cooperatively with monolingual teachers.

c. Other staffing patterns. (explain)

COMMENTS:

Section III. Impact of Program

(1) Check items which relate to local district (LEA) support for the bilingual program. (Check all items which apply)

_____ a. A statement of position on bilingual education has been written and passed by the Board of Education.

_____ b. The LEA has approved the use of local funds to expand the bilingual program.

_____ c. The LEA has committed the use of local funds to continue the bilingual program beyond federal funding.

_____ d. The LEA has adopted some of the successful bilingual materials and methods in non-bilingual schools.

_____ e. The LEA is making an earnest effort to fill all teaching positions in the bilingual program with bilingual teachers.

COMMENTS:

(2) Do you have a bilingual program now in operation not funded by Title VII?
_____Yes _____No

a. If yes at what grade levels_____

b. Date program began_____

c. Total student enrollment_____Ethnic breakdown_____ _____ _____ _____
Mexican American | Anglo | Black | Other (Spec

d. Source of funds: 1. Title I_____ 2. Local_____ 5. Other (Specify)
3. ESAA_____ 4. State_____

e. Give the number of bilingual program schools now in operation not funded by Title VII for each level indicated:

Pre-K	K	Elementary	Junior High	High School	Parochial

(3) Indicate the general attitude of each of the following target groups toward supporting your bilingual program.

	High	Good	Moderate	Low	Lack Basis for Comment
Board of Education					
School Administration					
Project School Principals					
Project Staff (Including teachers)					
Teachers in non-bilingual classes					
Parents of Project pupils					
Pupils in bilingual program					
Project Para-Professional Personnel					
Local Teacher Association					
Local College of Education or Teacher Training Institutions					
Community-at-Large					
Local Area-State Legislative Delegation					
Local Area-National Congressional Delegation					

(4) To what extent has your program influenced adjacent districts having Spanish-speaking students to develop bilingual programs? (Using the following rating scale, circle appropriate number.)

Greatly Influential 1 2 3 4 5 Not Influential

(5) To what extent has your bilingual program influenced area colleges and universities to modify their teacher training curriculum to accommodate the special needs of teachers in bilingual education? (Using the following rating scale, circle the appropriate number.)

Greatly Influential 1 2 3 4 5 Not Influential

COMMENTS:

(1) Does your program publish a parent newsletter? _____Yes _____No

(2) Are funds specifically designated in your ESEA Title VII budget to support parent involvement in your program? (e.g. community agents, visiting teachers, supplies for parent activities) _____Yes _____No

(3) Check all of those activities listed below which apply to your parent involvement component:

____ a. Parents work as volunteer aides in the bilingual program.

____ b. Parents help promote cultural development in the bilingual schools. (e.g. by telling stories of Mexican American folklore and history)

____ c. Parents participate in advisory councils in each of the project schools.

____ d. Parents assist in the writing of bilingual curriculum materials.

e. Others (Specify)

(4) Check items below which best describe your bilingual program advisory council:

____ a. The advisory council is composed chiefly of parents of project students.

____ b. The members of the advisory council are selected by the bilingual program staff.

____ c. The members of the advisory council are selected by project parents.

____ d. The advisory council is functioning in accordance with guidelines which council members have prepared.

e. To what extent does your advisory council influence decision-making as it relates to your program development and implementation? (Using the rating scale, circle the appropriate number.)

Greatly Influential				Not Influential
1	2	3	4	5

f. List the major functions of your advisory council.

g. The advisory council meets: (Check one)

____Two times during the school year.
____Four times during the school year.
____Each month during the school year.
____Whenever the Council chairperson deems necessary.
____Whenever the program director deems necessary.
____Other (Specify)

Section V. Other Relevant Information

(1) Please indicate degree of pupil success in each of the bilingual program subject areas listed below. Show this on the rating scale as an overall average for your project. Indicate evaluative instrument(s) used to assess subject area progress.

Subject Area	Degree of Success				Evaluative Instruments
	High	Good	Moderate	Low	
Spanish Reading					
English Reading					
English as a Second Language					
Spanish as a Second Language					
Mathematics					
Science					
Social Studies					
Bicultural Development (development of affective domain)					
Pre-school English Language developments					
Pre-school Spanish Language developments					

(2) Please indicate your major concerns relative to the development of your bilingual education program.

(Use back of page if needed)

(3) List major recommendations based on your experience for any or all of the following:

1. National Legislation
2. State Legislation
3. National Institute of Education
4. U.S. Office of Education
5. School Boards
6. State Department of Education
7. Teacher Training Institutions
8. Chicano communities and parents

Please return complete questionaire by November 13, 1973 to:

National Education Task Force De La Raza
The University of New Mexico
College of Education, Room 232
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131

(Use back of page if needed)

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

ESEA TITLE VII PROJECTS RECEIVING

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Arizona

Mr. Servando B. Carrillo
Bilingual Education
2411 East Buckeye Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85034

Ms. María Luisa Vega
Bilingual Education
512 East Van Buren
Phoenix, Arizona 85006

Mr. Edward L. Madrid
Bilingual Education
1010 East 10th Street
Tucson, Arizona 85717

Mr. Hamon Watson
Bilingual Education
402 Martinez Street
Nogales, Arizona 85621

California

Dr. Harry C. Allison
Bilingual Education
2348 Mariposa Street
Fresno, California 93721

Mr. Leo S. Cardona
Bilingual Education
1405 French Street
Santa Anna, California 92701

Ms. Susan T. Flores
4400 Cathedral Oaks Road
Santa Barbara, California 93111

Mr. Leo Grijalva
Bilingual Education
11120 Broaded Street
Santa Fe Springs, California 90670

Ms. Harriett Jowett
Bilingual Education
2314 Mariposa Street
Fresno, California 93721

Mr. Joe Bravo, Jr.
Bilingual Education
P.O. Box 710
Santa Paula, California 93060

Mrs. Juanita Cirilo
Bilingual Education
15959 East Gale Avenue
La Puente, California 91744

Mr. Frank Goodman
Bilingual Education
Thomas Jefferson School
2508 East 113rd Street
Compton, California

Mrs. Georgebelle S. Jordan
Bilingual Education
551 South "H" Street
Barstow, California 92311

Mr. Paul H. Juárez
Bilingual Education
1130 Fifth Avenue
Chula Vista, California 92011

California (continued)

Ms. Victoria Kaplan
Bilingual Education
School and Henry Street
Ukiah, California 95482

Mr. Joseph P. Licano
Bilingual Education
P.O. Box 218
Gonzales, California 93926

Mr. Felipe E. Lozano
Bilingual Education
504 "J" Street, Del Monte Square
Marysville, California 95901

Mrs. Toni Micotti
Bilingual Education
San Antonio School Module
1855 East San Antonio Street
San Jose, California 95110

Mr. Isaac R. Montanez
Bilingual Education
250 First Street
Brentwood, California 94513

Mr. Richard G. Roche
Bilingual Education
965 Main Street
St. Helena, California 94574

Mr. Hector Solís
Bilingual Education
202 County Civic Center
Visalia, California 93277

Mr. Henry Vásquez
Bilingual Education
1801 7th Street
Sanger, California 93657

Mr. John S. Kately
Bilingual Education
304 Center Street
Healdsburg, California 95448

Mr. Americo López-Rodríguez
Bilingual Education
California State University
Fullerton
Fullerton, California 92634

Mr. David L. Martínez
Bilingual Education
2930 21st Avenue
Sacramento, California 95820

Mr. Harvey N. Miller
Bilingual Education
Box 792
Calexico, California 92231

Mr. Ken Noonan
Bilingual Education
800 South Garey Avenue
Pomona, California 91766

Mr. Robert Rodríguez
Bilingual Education
4020 North Gibson Road
El Monte, California 91731

Mr. Ricardo Valenzuela
Bilingual Education
701 North Madison Street
Stockton, California 95202

Mr. Kenneth G. Woody
Bilingual Education
815 Allerton Street
Redwood City, California 94063

Colorado

Ms. Lena Archuleta
Office of Federal Projects
2320 West 4th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80223

Florida

Mr. Fred Pezzulio
Bilingual Education
1001 Third Avenue North
Naples, Florida 33940

Illinois

Mr. Eduardo Cadavid
Bilingual Education
228 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Michigan

Mr. José Frank Soriano
86 Park Hurst
Pontiac, Michigan 48058

New Mexico

Mr. Bill Gutiérrez
Bilingual Education
1106 West Quay Avenue
Artesia, New Mexico 88210

Mr. Arturo Méndez
Bilingual Education
P.O. Box 8
Grants, New Mexico 87020

Mr. J. Paul Taylor
Bilingual Education
K-3 Project, 1850 North Church
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001

Mr. Louis F. Martínez
Bilingual Education
P.O. Box 249
Espanola, New Mexico 87532

Mr. Carlos Saavedra
Bilingual Education
P.O. Box 1927
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103

Texas

Ms. María Barrera
Bilingual Education
6404 Tracor Lane
Austin, Texas 78721

Ms. Irene García
Bilingual Education
P.O. Box 120
La Joya, Texas 78560

Texas (continued)

Mr. Wendell Jones
Bilingual Education
Drawer E
Abernathy, Texas 79311

Mr. Raúl Muñoz, Jr.
Bilingual Education
3202 Weslayan Road, Suite 252
Houston, Texas 77027

A. R. Ramírez
Bilingual Education
101 South Tenth Street
Edinburg, Texas 78539

Mr. James Lehmann
Bilingual Education
3210 West Lancaster
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

Mr. J. B. Peña
Bilingual Education
P.O. Box 1229
Del Rio, Texas 78840

Mr. Ruben Rodríguez
Bilingual Education
P.O. Box 990
101 North 8th
Edinburg, Texas 78539

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

ESEA TITLE VII PROJECTS RESPONDING TO NATIONAL

BILINGUAL BICULTURAL INSTITUTE SURVEY

Arizona

Mr. Edward L. Madrid
Bilingual Education
Tucson, Arizona

Ms. María Luisa Vega
Bilingual Education
Phoenix, Arizona

California

Dr. H. C. Allison
Bilingual Program
Fresno Schools
Fresno, California

Mr. Leo S. Cardona
Bilingual Program
Santa Anna Unified School District
Santa Anna, California 92701

Ms. Susan T. Flores
Bilingual Program
Santa Barbara, California 93111

John S. Kately
Bilingual Program
Healdsburg Union Elementary
St. Healdsburg, California

Dr. David L. Martínez
Bilingual Program
Sacramento City Unified School
Sacramento, California 95820

Mrs. Toni Micotti
Bilingual Program
San Antonio School Module
San Jose, California 95110

Mr. Harvey N. Miller
Bilingual Program
Calexico Unified School District
Calexico, California

Ken A. Noonan
Bilingual Program
Pamona Unified Schools
Pamona, California

R. Roche
Bilingual Program
St. Helena High School District
St. Helena, California

Robert Rodríguez
Bilingual Program
El Monte Elementary School District
El Monte, California

Colorado

Mrs. Lena Archuleta
Bilingual Program
Office of Federal Projects
Denver, Colorado

Florida

Mr. Fred Pezzullo
Bilingual Program
1001 Third Avenue North
Naples, Florida 33940

New Mexico

Bill Gutiérrez
Bilingual Program
Artesia, New Mexico 88210

Arturo Méndez
Bilingual Program
Grants Municipal Schools
Grants, New Mexico

J. Paul Taylor
Bilingual Program
Las Cruces School District
Las Cruces, New Mexico

Louis F. Martínez
Bilingual Program
Espanola Municipal Schools
Espanola, New Mexico

Carlos Saavedra
Bilingual Program
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Texas

Maria Barrera
Bilingual Program
Education Service Center XIII
Austin, Texas

Rene González
Bilingual Program
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas

Raúl Muñoz, Jr.
Bilingual Program
Houston ISD
Houston, Texas

Alonso Perales
Bilingual Program
San Antonio, Texas

Gloria Gámez
Bilingual Program
Edgewood ISD
San Antonio, Texas

James Lehmann
Bilingual Program
Fort Worth, Texas

J. B. Peña
Bilingual Program
San Felipe Del Rio
Consolidated ISD
Del Rio, Texas

A. R. Ramírez
Bilingual Program
ESC Region I
Edinburg, Texas

Texas (continued)

Doris Rector
Bilingual Program
Lubbock, Texas

Francisco Rodríguez
Bilingual Program
Zapata, Texas

Joel Vela
Bilingual Program
San Angelo, Texas

Carolyn Wade
Bilingual Program
Abenathy, Texas

Wisconsin

Anthony Gradisnik
Bilingual Program
Milwaukee, Wisconsin